UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION JEFF YOUNG, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, CASE NO. 4:17-cv-06252-YGR **CLASS ACTION** Plaintiff, [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION FOR vs. **CLASS CERTIFICATION** CREE Inc., Date: April 21, 2020 Time: 2:00 p.m. Crtrm.: Courtroom 1 - 4th Floor Defendant. Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

922748.1 4:17-cv-06252-YGR

1	
2	in
3	th
4	Pr
5	
6	Pr
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Re
14	

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The Court, having considered Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Class Certification, including the pleadings and other papers on file in this action, and the statements of counsel and the parties, hereby finds that the motion satisfies the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, and hereby orders that Plaintiff's motion is GRANTED.

1. The Court therefore certifies the following class under Federal Rule of Civil rocedure 23 (the "Class"):

All persons in California who purchased Cree LED Lightbulbs for end use, and not resale, during the period from March 2013 to the present. Excluded from the Class are Cree, including its corporate affiliates, parents, or subsidiaries; Cree's employees, including officers and directors; and the Court to which this case is assigned.

- 2. The Court appoints Plaintiff Jeff Young as the representative for the Class ("Class Representative").
- 3. The Court finds that the law firms of Pearson, Simon, & Warshaw, LLP; Audet & Partners, LLP; Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP; Levin Sedran & Berman; and The Sultzer Law Group P.C. satisfy the requirements of Rule 23(g) and are hereby appointed as counsel for the Class ("Class Counsel").
- 4. The Court finds that the Class satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(a) for the following reasons:
- a. The Class satisfies the numerosity requirement of Rule 23(a)(1), because there are sufficiently numerous class members in the Class, making joinder of all class members impracticable.
- b. The Class satisfies the commonality requirement of Rule 23(a)(2), because the Class raises common issues of law and fact relating to Defendant's alleged misrepresentations and omissions concerning the longevity of the LED Lightbulbs and Defendant's violations of California's Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, and Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750. Common issues likewise exist for the Class's claims for fraudulent misrepresentation and

concealment, breach of express and implied warranties, and unjust enrichment/quasi-contract.

- c. The Class Representative satisfies the typicality requirement of Rule 23(a)(3), because the Class Representative has suffered the same injury as other class members by purchasing LED Lightbulbs that were sold not as advertised and at a premium price as a result of Defendant's false advertising.
- d. The Class Representative and Class Counsel satisfy the adequacy requirement of Rule 23(a)(4) because they have no interests that are antagonistic to the interests of the Class. The Class Representative has demonstrated that he is willing and able to fulfill his duties as a representative of the Class. Further, Class Counsel are experienced and knowledgeable in the prosecution of complex litigation and class actions, such as this litigation. Class Counsel have demonstrated their abilities to adequately represent the Class throughout this litigation, including in securing class certification.
- 5. The Court finds that the Class satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) because questions of law and fact common to the members of the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, including legal and factual issues relating to liability and damages. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. In addition, if the class action mechanism were not available, Class members may have claims that are too small to justify the high costs of litigation.
- 6. The Class satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(b)(2) because Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds that apply generally to the class, so that final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief is appropriate respecting the class as a whole.
- 7. Class Counsel shall file their proposed plan for providing notice to the Class pursuant to Rule 23(c)(2) within 30 days of the issuance of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:

Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

United States District Judge

922748.1 3 4:17-cv-06252-YGR